"good Faith"

April 6, 1969

Mr. Carl W. Belcher, Chief
General Crimes Section
Criminal Division
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Mr. Belcher,

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I today sent Dr. James Rhoads, Archivist of the United States. I hope you will take the time to consider its complaint in the context of your letter to me of March 26.

In sending it to you, I hope I am demonstrating faith in what you wrote me. I am also offering you a chance to establish the good faith of the Department of Justice. I believe the insistent refusal of the Archives to provide me with a copy of what I believe I am entitled to or a clear written statement of their reasons for refusing it is entirely inconsistent with what you seem to believe to be the case as it is with any kind of decent scholarship or honest administration of the Archives. I believe it is raw suppression, by the exercise of raw power alone. It is even worse than appears on the surface for there is no secret about that memorandum of transfer. I have known about it since late 1966. The panel report is the first official acknowledgement of it. Previously its official existence had been officially denied to me.

If you do not understand the significance of my comments relative to CD47:7, let me explain that this, although the FBI is careful to disguise it and almost everything else it deemed it could hide, refers to an arrest in Chicago immediately prior to the assassination of a man who Federal agents believed threatened the President. You may recall his trip at that time was abruptly cancelled. My investigation outside the Warren Commission files reveals much, including federal interest. As I wrote Dr. Rhoads, either the pertinent reports about this incident are in his files and I am entitled to them or a statement of reason for their denial or they are not there and should be, in which event this would still be true. This is not the only such case. I call it to your attention because it is immediately before me. If the FBI did not provide this to the Commission, it engaged in suppression of essential information of immediate interest to the Commission. Can there be any doubt this is precisely what the Commission was supposed to be investigating, or of its interest in other threats against the President, etc.?

I do hope you will look into this and help me obtain what I believe I am properly entitled to, in both cases.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg